

KAK

27 June 1956

RHB

90

## OSI Qualitative Adequacy Rating Problem

25X1A9a

25X1A9a 25X1A9a

1. This matter goes deeper than any question of what I did or did not say to [REDACTED]. However, to nail down this point first I state now that I never agreed with [REDACTED] that Chapter VII contributions would be judged solely on "clarity of presentation," nor was anything ever said that could be considered a reflection on [REDACTED] competence in any manner whatsoever. I know her educational and experience background and have an exceptionally high opinion of her as a person and as an editor. I have made this clear to [REDACTED] who stated that he shared my high opinion of [REDACTED] and also acknowledged that he could not support his statement of an "agreement" other than it was the "impression" he got from his several discussions with me on the rating matter.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

2. I do not remember all that was said, but I do have a very clear recollection of the gist of these discussions. I did say that Chapter VII was unique in that it was the only NIS element for which coordination of production responsibility was charged directly to a subcommittee of the IAC, while for all other elements this responsibility was charged to the agencies engaged in the program. A point was raised on [REDACTED] being the sole editor reviewing Chapter VII material with its wide range of scientific coverage, whereas for other material we have specialists in the various fields covered by the Chapter. I didn't dispute the fact that [REDACTED] did most of the review of Chapter VII material for I know that OSI dealings on all Chapter VII contributions had been with [REDACTED] almost exclusively. I also acknowledged that in other editorial units we had editors who specialized to a large extent on certain topics within the Chapters because of their very high qualifications in the technical fields covered, and I mentioned [REDACTED] the Military Geography unit as an example. I may also have mentioned [REDACTED] of the Transportation unit--I don't recall. With respect to [REDACTED]'s review of Chapter VII materials I don't recall, and I am sure that I did not go beyond saying that she was undoubtedly better qualified in certain of the topical fields covered in VII than in others, the same as [REDACTED] are on the wide range of topics covered in Chapters II and III.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

NO CHANGE IN  
DECLASS  
CLASS. CHANGED  
NEXT REVIEW DATE  
AUTH: [REDACTED]

DATE 4 NOV 1980

SUBJECT: OSI Qualitative Adequacy Rating

27 June 1956

3. I think it would be unreasonable to expect, and that [redacted] would be the last one to claim, substantive review capabilities on all technical treatments in all sections of Chapter VII. If she does have such capabilities then I have certainly underrated her.

25X1A9a

4. In connection with this substantive review matter, I am sure that I pointed out as I have many times in the past that no change in the substantive content of a contribution is made in this Office without the concurrence of the producing office. One further point-- whenever questions have been raised with me on rating of a particular section I have taken the position that this was a matter of editorial judgment, and referred the questioner to the Editorial Division, as I did with Miss [redacted] when she called me recently and blew her top on rating given a Chapter IX element.

25X1A9a

5. Army request [redacted] came over here Friday morning, 22 June, to discuss this matter. Several things came to light that were entirely new to me, which seem to point up the real root of this trouble. He said that their objection to the present rating system was centered chiefly on the criteria for the Category I and II ratings.

25X1A9a

6. With respect to Category I criteria he said the SEC position is that their procedures for producing Chapter VII

**SUBJECT: OSI Qualitative Adequacy Rating**

**27 June 1956**

3. I think it would be unreasonable to expect, and that [REDACTED] would be the last one to claim, substantive review capabilities on all technical treatments in all sections of Chapter VII. If she does have such capabilities then I have certainly underrated her.

25X1A9a

4. In connection with this substantive review matter, I am sure that I pointed out, as I have many times in the past, that no change in the substantive content of a contribution is made in this Office without concurrence of the producing office. One further point--whenver questions have been raised with me on rating of a particular section I have taken the position that this was a matter of editorial judgment, and referred the questioner to the Editorial Division, as I did with [REDACTED] when she called me recently and blew her top on rating given a Chapter IX element.

5. At my request [REDACTED] came over here Friday morning, 22 June, to discuss this matter. Several things came to light that were entirely new to me, which seem to point up the real root of this trouble. He said that their objection to the present rating system was centered chiefly on the criteria for the Category I and II ratings.

6. With respect to Category I criteria he said the SEC position is that their procedures for producing Chapter VII elements leave only the matter of judgment on "clear presentation" open to rating consideration by OBI, and that unless there are serious deficiencies in this respect all their contributions should be rated Category I. Their position is based on the following considerations:

a. Before a contribution is submitted to OBI it has been coordinated with all agencies in the intelligence community, and approved by the SEC as meeting all requirements, subject to editorial opinion on "clear presentation." This means that approval of a contribution by SEC represents not only the opinion of the IAC agencies on the qualitative aspects, but also the judgment of the Joint Staff, the Atomic Energy Commission, and such other ad hoc representation as may be determined necessary by the regular committee members.

b. First drafts of all contributions are submitted to all members of the SEC and written comments are made on substantive and qualitative aspects. Revision is made on the basis of these comments, and the second draft is then circulated to the members. A final draft is then prepared incorporating

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

**SUBJECT: OSI Qualitative Adequacy Rating**

**27 June 1956**

any approved changes resulting from the second review. It is then given final approval by the SEC. The SEC position is that the qualitative and substantive aspects have been adjudged by the scientific intelligence agencies of government as fully meeting requirements of the Category I rating criteria and that any lower rating by OBI is a slap at the SEC, and completely inappropriate.

7. With respect to Category II [REDACTED] indicated that their objection 25X1A9a to the criteria for this category is that it suggests a barely acceptable contribution, and they are not in agreement that this is the case with all contributions receiving this rating. As a case in point he said they didn't feel that this would hold in the case of NIS 12 (VII), which is the contribution which started all this furor. It was prepared by [REDACTED] who was stationed in that area for 25X1A9a several years before coming to his present assignment. It is admittedly thin because there is not much there to write about, but they do not feel that it should be rated as "meeting minimum NIS standards" because of lack of more extensive scientific activity in the area. [REDACTED] took it as 25X1A9a reflecting on his competence and resented the implication of such a rating.

25X1A9a 8. [REDACTED] said that it is the criteria that is bothering them; that if the criteria for Category I were just "Outstanding" for example, or "Superior" or some such adjective, and for Category II "Satisfactory" or an equivalent word, they would never have raised a question on NIS 12(VII) as they do not feel that it warrants more than a Category II rating under such criteria. Furthermore, he felt that such criteria would do much to overcome any question by SEC regarding substantive review of Chapter VII material by OBI. 25X1A9a On this latter point [REDACTED] made a statement which surprised me very much. It was that since he had been with the program, which dates back to 1952, there had never been any question of a substantive nature raised with him, and that he had never seen any question of this nature in any of the notes Hammel had brought back from conferences over here.

25X1A9a 9. [REDACTED] also said that the guidance they had received from here was on other than substantive matters except for [REDACTED] complaining in general 25X1A9a terms of some of the contributions being pretty thin.

25X1A9a 10. [REDACTED] said the SEC would appreciate very much our giving consideration to changing the criteria for Categories I and II so as to avoid these hassels. He indicated that there may be a memo coming through from the Chairman, SEC, on this matter of review of Chapter VII material by OBI, and also on the criteria question.

**SUBJECT: OSI Qualitative Adequacy Rating**

**27 June 1956**

11. It was also indicated that they would appreciate our re-examining the basis for the Category II rating on NIS-12 (Chapter VII), and I told Rusco that I would bring this to your attention. I have not looked into it.

12. Finally, if any meeting is arranged for a discussion of these questions with SEC or OSI representatives, I feel that I should have the opportunity to sit in it in view of recent happenings.

25X1A9a